



ALAMEDA COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

1333 BROADWAY, SUITE 220 • OAKLAND, CA 94612 • PHONE: (510) 836-2560 • FAX: (510) 836-2185
E-MAIL: mail@accma.ca.gov • WEB SITE: accma.ca.gov

“TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT IN ALAMEDA COUNTY: IT CAN BE DONE!”

ALAMEDA COUNTY CMA TOD PROBLEM-SOLVING WORKSHOP – MARCH 28, 2005

WORKSHOP SUMMARY & NEXT STEPS



Morning speakers at TOD workshop

I. BACKGROUND

The five regional planning agencies, led by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), released a Smart Growth Vision for the nine-county Bay Area in 2002 that established a goal of capturing half of all new development over the next two decades around the region’s transit hubs and corridors. In December 2003, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) made a commitment to assist in the implementation of the vision by adopting a Transportation/Land Use Platform. The platform establishes MTC’s overall approach to improving the integration of transportation and land use in the Bay Area. As part of the implementation of this policy, MTC entered into an expanded partnership with each of the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), including Alameda County CMA, to facilitate the integration of transportation and land use planning, known as “Transportation Planning and Land Use Solutions” or “T-PLUS”. MTC is providing annual funds to each of the CMAs to support this work

To date, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (CMA)’s participation in this program has been by developing TOD policy and guidelines to provide direction for TOD funding and working with local jurisdictions to administer TOD fund programs.

A major focus in Alameda County has been working closely with local jurisdictions to identify ways to help deliver TOD projects more quickly because although CMA, MTC, ABAG, and several cities throughout Alameda County have developed Smart Growth policies to promote transit-oriented development, CMA has found TOD projects are not getting built as quickly as expected in Alameda County.

To find out why TODs are not getting built or are moving along very slowly in Alameda County, Alameda County CMA held a series of meetings with city and county staff, private and non-profit developers, transit agency staff and elected officials. Seven major obstacles to building TODs in Alameda County were identified in these meetings:

- a. Hazardous materials liability on undeveloped TOD sites;
- b. Railroad right-of-way negotiations;
- c. Getting permits and environmental clearance;
- d. Land use conflicts (i.e., industrial TODs);
- e. Coordinating among multiple agencies;
- f. Getting funding, and
- g. Overcoming onerous parking requirements.

The following eight TOD sites in Alameda County are identified in the CMA Countywide Transportation Plan and are in various stages in the entitlement process:

- a. MacArthur
- b. Coliseum
- c. W. Oakland
- d. San Leandro
- e. Union City
- f. Dublin/Pleasanton
- g. Ashby/Ed Roberts
- h. Warm Springs

A status report about all of these sites was included in the workshop packet and is available on the CMA website at www.accma.ca.gov.

II. WHO WAS INVITED

Signed-in attendance was 55, not including the speakers. The following individuals and groups attended the workshop:

- Transit Agencies - BART Real Estate & Planning, AC Transit, Union Pacific Railroad.
- Developers - Signature Property, Aegis, TMG Partners, Ed Roberts Campus.
- Regional transportation, land use and resource agencies — ABAG, ACTIA, MTC, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, Bay Area Air Quality Control District, State Department of Toxic Substances Control, Alameda County LINK
- Consulting firm (URS and Townsend Public Affairs) and architects
- Public

- Cities, Counties — Alameda County, City of Fremont, Oakland Housing Authority, City of San Leandro, City of Oakland, City of Union City, City of Livermore, City of Emeryville, City of Alameda
- Elected officials — Congresswoman Barbara Lee’s office, County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Oakland Councilmember Larry Reid, Emeryville Councilmember Nora Davis, BART Boardmember Thomas Blalock

III. SPEAKERS

Oakland Councilmember and CMA Chair Larry Reid and Alameda County Supervisor and CMA Vice Chair Scott Haggerty welcomed attendees to the workshop. Speakers for each obstacle listed in #I above were selected to speak at the workshop, as follows. Speakers’ PowerPoint presentations are available the Alameda County CMA website at www.accma.ca.gov under Transportation and Land Use:

a. “SUCCESS STORY”

Steve Lawton
Community Development Director
City of Hercules
11 Civic Drive
Hercules, CA 94547
(510) 799-8233
slawton@ci.hercules.ca.us

Tom Weigel
The Surland Companies
902 Central Ave., Suite 5
Tracy, CA 95376
(949) 394-3994
tom@theredbarnco.com

As Community Development Director for the City of Hercules, Steve Lawton is applying his 20 years of business development experience to the challenge of redeveloping Central Hercules, former site of the world’s largest explosives factory. Central Hercules is the location of two TODs: a Waterfront District with Capitol Corridor and ferry terminals, and a New Town Center with express-bus regional transit and future BART station. He spearheaded the Central Hercules Plan, the first form-based code adopted in California, which is helping to transform Hercules from a bedroom community to a place with a vibrant downtown and waterfront. The Waterfront envisioned in the plan is partially completed and the New Town Center has just received the initial redevelopment approvals.

Tom Weigel is the president of The Red Barn Company, a development management company based in Newport Beach, California, and is the Managing Partner of Hercules NTC, LLC, a 25-acre mixed-use/transit-oriented Town Center Redevelopment Agency project in the City of Hercules. Additionally, The Red Barn Company is actively working on two other transit based mixed-use real estate developments in Northern California. Tom’s 25 years of real estate development experience and 15 years of broad experience in managing the land development process gives him the practical ability to not only envision, but to see the vision through to the making of real and memorable places.

Mr. Lawton and Mr. Weigel briefly described the political and development processes of the two Hercules TODs. Mr. Lawton explained the importance of the public/private partnership between the City, Redevelopment Agency, BART and the developers in developing a vision,

working with the opportunities and constraints of the project area, assembling parcels and financing the project. Aside from the step-by-step process that is detailed in their PowerPoint presentations (on the ACCMA website), Mr. Lawton explained what he believed was key to the design and economic success of these TODs. This key was the quality and experience of the developers. He described how the City held out for the best developers they could find. Mr. Weigel described how he kept coming back to the City time and time again, until he had successfully convinced them of his high quality of work and commitment to pedestrian-friendly TODs. Mr. Lawton encouraged other cities to hold developers to this high standard in order to ensure continued community acceptance and high property values of future TODs.

b. “LAND USE CONFLICTS AND TODS”

K. Kelley McKenzie
New United Motor Manufacturing
45500 Fremont Blvd
Fremont, CA 94538
(510) 770-4045
kmckenzie@nummi.com

Kelley McKenzie is Chief Counsel and Corporate Secretary at New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc. (“NUMMI”). NUMMI is an automobile manufacturing facility in Fremont established by Toyota Motor Company and General Motors Corporation in 1984. NUMMI employs approximately 5,700 team members and produces approximately 350,000 vehicles per year.

Mr. McKenzie discussed NUMMI’s interests and concerns about a BART station and residential transit-oriented development at the proposed Warm Springs BART station, Fremont adjacent to the existing NUMMI plant. Given the manufacturing business, the plant generates noise, light and odors, which may be perceived as a nuisance to future residents. Mr. McKenzie described his views on how he thought an industrial plant might co-exist with a BART station TOD, with an emphasis on commercial or industrial uses.

c. BROWNFIELDS / HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Barbara Cook
Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Berkeley Regional Office
700 Heinz Avenue, Suite 200C
Berkeley, California 94710
(510) 540-3843
bcook@dtsc.ca.gov

Barbara Cook has over 22 years of experience in the hazardous waste and site cleanup programs and is a registered civil engineer in the State of California. She supervises a staff of over 20 engineers and scientists who oversee the investigation and remediation of contaminated properties for the California Department of Toxic Substances Control in the northern coastal counties in California, including the San Francisco Bay area. Ms. Cook has extensive experience in both the state and federal Superfund cleanup programs including site

assessments, technologies used to define the extent of contamination and in developing site cleanup goals, and Brownfields redevelopment.

Ms. Cook discussed steps to take to minimize potential future risk associated with a site that contains hazardous materials, what types of uses and chemicals trigger higher levels of risk, how groundwater contamination is a major concern, who is responsible for hazardous materials investigations, as well as resources for expediting the process of addressing hazardous materials on TOD sites.

a. “PERMITTING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE”

Mike Ghielmetti
Signature Properties
4670 Willow Road, Suite 200
Pleasanton, CA 94588
(925) 463-1122
mghielmetti@sigprop.com

Michael Ghielmetti has worked on a variety of projects in Alameda County, from the 60-acre Port of Oakland site to a variety of housing developments near transit in Pleasanton, Oakland and Livermore. He said that Signature Properties is committed to bringing people close to work centers, leisure activities and public transportation.

Mr. Ghielmetti described some of the details of his current projects but, most importantly, he gave some overarching advice to the audience for their TOD projects. He said that the biggest obstacle to TOD success is “nimbyism” and “lack of political will” during the entitlement process. At this point in the process, the developer’s costs are the highest and they are the most at risk. Purchasing the land is not as risky, because it can always be resold. Building the project and selling or renting buildings and housing is not as risky because there is something tangible to sell. It is only during the entitlement process when everything is at risk. In saying this, he minimized the concern of other obstacles, such as hazardous materials cleanup, which, he said, “just costs money but it’s not an unpredictable process like the political one.” He advised the audience to focus on the political process above all.

b. RAIL ISSUES

Rick Gooch
Director of Special Properties
Union Pacific Railroad
49 Stevenson Street, Suite 1050
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 541-7050
RLGOOCH@up.com

Rick Gooch is Director of Special Properties for Union Pacific Railroad. Rick has degrees in education and law and has worked in railroad real estate for nearly 25 years. His focus is value enhancement and sale of excess railroad property and he negotiates the sale of railroad rights of way for a variety of public and private uses. In the past he has negotiated the sale of

the San Bruno Branch for extension of BART from Colma to the San Francisco International Airport, the sale of the Milpitas line to Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) for the future extension of BART from Fremont to San Jose, and the sale of the Vasona Branch to VTA for the extension of light rail from Diridon Station in San Jose to the City of Campbell.

Several of the TOD sites identified in the Countywide Transportation Plan are adjacent to Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way, including Union City, San Leandro, and Coliseum BART stations. Mr. Gooch told the audience why housing next to rail lines is a concern for Union Pacific. He said that the development of nearby BART stations is something that they support, but it is not their primary purpose as a company. Their primary purpose is to move trains. If they take a lead role in the development process, it comes back to haunt them, he said, as the usual delays can easily make projects financially infeasible. At that point, staff at their agency feel they are put in a predicament. Their preferred method of working with developers is to give help and assistance at key points along the way, rather than taking a lead role.

Mr. Gooch also mentioned that the suicide accident last summer on the rail line in Southern California highlights a design interest of Union Pacific Railroad. They want to have their rail corridors completely inaccessible to the general public, in order to prevent accidents such as occurred last summer. To that end, they prefer that new buildings back onto the railroad tracks and that streets do not front onto railroad tracks.

In the end, he reiterated his support for transit-oriented development near Union Pacific properties.

c. THE PARKING REPLACEMENT DILEMMA

Patrick Siegman
Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates
785 Market Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 284-1544
patrick@siegman.biz

Patrick Siegman, Principal Associate at Nelson/Nygaard has worked with communities on Transit-Oriented Development plans for major mixed-use projects in Oakland, Petaluma and South Pasadena, California. These plans combined innovative transportation demand management strategies, and shared parking and parking management strategies, both of which minimized development costs while delivering high transit ridership.

In Alameda County, many TODs are on BART property on former surface parking lots. BART or the local city or county usually requires a 1:1 parking replacement to remove the surface parking. On limited available land, this often translates to a parking structure requirement, costing \$25,000 or more per space.

Mr. Siegman discussed parking alternatives to Alameda County's typical requirements of replacing surface parking 1:1, focusing on options that could work at BART sites with surface

parking replacement requirements. He presented examples of parking solutions used throughout California and the US. His example solutions included establishing maximum parking requirements; developing mixed use zones; creating residential parking permit areas and parking benefit districts; initiating parking fees; using employer incentives, such as free transit passes, and charging or “unbundling” parking fees separate from the costs of a residential unit. He also discussed how audience members can gain broad support for parking alternatives, including focusing on parking needs, reducing costs of providing excessive parking, and generating income.

d. AGENCY COORDINATION

Joan Malloy
Planning Manager
City of Union City
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road
Union City, CA 94587
(510) 675-5327
jmalloy@ci.union-city.ca.us

Joan Malloy is the Planning Manager at the City of Union City. She has a background in urban planning and landscape architecture. In the past several years she has overseen the preparation of the Intermodal Station District and Transit Facility Plan (2001) and the 2002 General Plan. Ms. Malloy continues to work in a team with other staff members to implement the Intermodal Station District Plan, which is ongoing.

All TOD projects require coordination of a variety of city and county departments. Union City found this out first-hand while working on its Union Landing TOD at the BART station. Ms. Malloy told the audience how Union City successfully coordinated with agencies (state, county and local) to implement its TOD project and the importance of strong political will in getting this done. She cited the main reasons for the interagency cooperation as 1) Stakeholders saw that this was a “real” project because the City was unanimous in their commitment to it; 2) The formation of a central TOD committee that met on a regular basis and, 3) Attention to detail in following up on meeting invitations and RSVPs, and keeping lists up-to-date for subsequent meetings.

e. TOD FUNDING

Matt Todd, Senior Transportation Engineer in Programming and Projects
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
1333 Broadway, Suite 220
Oakland, CA 94612
510.836.2560 X 13
ffurger@accma.ca.gov

Matt Todd has been with Alameda County Congestion Management Agency for five years. Before CMA, he was with Solano Transportation Authority for five years. Matt is part of CMA’s team that has been responsible for programming \$1 billion for transportation projects in Alameda County since CMA’s inception in 1989.

One of the most common recurring concerns cities, the county and developers have about getting TOD projects built is finding enough funds for the transportation improvements for TODs in Alameda County. With sidewalks costing over one-half million per block and garage parking spaces at \$25,000 or more per space, project sponsors need to know how to get on the road map for federal, state and local transportation funds that are available.

Mr. Todd explained the process and schedule for how a typical TOD project should go about getting funding, beginning with getting into the Countywide Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Plan. He also explained that once a project is in the Plan, it is not yet funded until it is programmed. He explained how and when projects get funded, which federal, state and regional agencies are responsible for reviewing and evaluating projects and the schedule, or funding cycles, for each. Federal funds that may be available for TOD projects include Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). State funds that could be available for TODs are generally the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which is tied to and influenced by the State budget. Regional funds include Transportation Funds for Clean Air or TFCA. He also noted that once a project is programmed, the sponsor needs to fulfill requirements of the funding agency.

f. LUNCHTIME PRESENTATION “HOW THE FRUITVALE STATION GOT BUILT”



Arabella Martinez speaking with Jeff Hobson, TALC

Arabella Martinez is the former CEO of The Unity Council and was the driving force behind the successful Fruitvale BART TOD project.

Ms. Martinez explained that it took many years to gather community support, political will and funds necessary to build the Fruitvale Transit Village. The project required establishing connections within the community and developing a shared vision. As the developer, the Unity Council also had to demonstrate their commitment to the community. One way they did this was by building the Senior Housing project as a demonstration of a successful, high quality project. Building the Fruitvale Transit Village also required support from elected and appointed officials. In addition, it required strong leadership, a strong Board of Directors, strong executive and fiscal management, and sophisticated development and financing knowledge and fundraising skills. With this, they were able to assemble land on 19 acres by the Fruitvale BART station, address

environmental hazards, amend zoning to allow the development, gain political and financial support for the transit village, and gain access to capital and financing from an assortment of over 30 fund sources.

IV. BREAKOUT GROUPS

After the presentations, attendees assembled into small groups based on specific obstacles. Approximately 25 attendees (one-half of total attendees) participated in these small groups.



Breakout sessions

Following are the notes from the breakout sessions:

g. FUNDING

Approach:

- How you develop budget is important—consider coordinating phasing with different funds that are available.
- Look for potential fund sources for the part of the project in which you need funding.
- Piece funds together.
- Consider sitting down with more than one project and see who needs what and prioritize.
- Leverage pre-development fund sources as an early priority.
- No gap between construction financing and permanent financing.
- Use “shotgun” approach to grant applications (apply for as many as possible).
- Get credit enhancement with a financial institution.
- Explore non-transportation sources like Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Government fund sources:

- Transportation: Federal TEA reauthorization every 6 years; Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC—Regional MTC and local CMA) every 1-2 years; Building American Bond SB 1109 (1 time); Appropriations (Federal) annually; State Transportation Improvement Program or STIP (depends on State budget); Transportation Fund for Clean Air or TFCA; City funds; redevelopment funds; Dept. of Commerce, EDA (street narrowing, pedestrian plaza, etc.)
- Brownfields: Brownfields funds, Sec. 1083, EPA
- Non-transportation: Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

Other funding options:

- Private financing (private/public partnership);
- Foundations and corporations pre-development (Ford, Haas, San Francisco Foundation); include non-profit in mix;
- Bridge loans;
- Land swaps;
- Bonds/ 501(c)3 bonds;
- Fund swaps case-by-case;
- Lease property to City;
- Enhanced enterprise;
- Bank loans;
- Charge for parking;
- Parking finance bonds.

Potential future fund sources:

- Kleh's proposed bill (vehicle registration fee)
- Higher bridge tolls
- Tax increment financing (Perata's bill).

h. RAIL ISSUES

- Union Pacific (UP) said they are a willing partner if local agencies takes the lead and brings UP in when the project is "real," (i.e., funding in place)
- Get small wins first before going to UP.
- This breakout session had very intense discussions regarding particular TOD problems that participants were working on. One member of the audience, who may have been at this small breakout session, wrote in his survey, "I have a major issue with rail crossings – didn't solve the issue but agreed to have follow-up conversation with Union Pacific." Steve Lawton, Hercules Planning Director, was at this table and said that it was invaluable to have face-to-face time with UP representatives.

c. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- Expressed a concern that in the future, child daycare and schools may be limited next to freeways due to air emissions at TOD sites. A related bill is currently in the legislature.

d. LAND USE CONFLICTS

Issues:

- NUMMI: BART purchased property behind their site years ago and did not originally plan housing there. NUMMI would like BART to get ridership while not affecting NUMMI's business operations. NUMMI is concerned about potential industrial-residential land use conflicts when future residents who move close to industry, are then concerned about noise, light and odors associated with the industry.
- Issues: odors, lights, vibration, trucks, and possibility of environmental justice complaints.

- Community wants office use but there is not much market for this now. The people want a lively, walkable district like Rockridge, however, is there enough people there to provide this atmosphere?
- Need for regional coordination of housing/job locations, but sites need politically acceptable places to build housing.
- BAAQMD: Bay Area Air Quality Management District has permitting authority over industrial uses. They are working on air quality benefits of smart growth, but infill in existing industrial areas present air toxic issues. They look at the risk to residents of living near industry. BAAQMD provides CEQA comments and guidance on industrial issues.

Questions:

- Does every station need a TOD?
- Is Warm Springs a good place for a BART station?
- How can cities build adequate housing and save industry at the same time?
- Assuming BART is built at Warm Springs, are there any land uses that can support BART and not affect NUMMI's operations? Is it a good TOD environment? What could mitigate this?

Potential solutions for Warm Springs site:

- Park and ride
- Commercial and park & ride
- Commercial only BART Station – if there is a market and ridership associated with it.
- Defer the decision
- Use as park & ride initially
- Stay more or less as is (as long as new uses inconsistent with residential didn't develop) until BART actually reached San Jose, at which time more residential could be added.
- Don't build BART station right away or relocate or build Irvington station first.
- Balance amount of industry on site with the need to build housing here. Coordinate development and phasing with NUMMI's long-term plans at the site.
- Create land use buffer zones.

e. AGENCY COORDINATION

- Project needs to be “real” (i.e., politically supported and viable) before agencies will take it seriously and regularly attend meetings.
- Organize structured meetings early on. Identify issues and participants:
 - Community (neighborhood, user groups)
 - Planning Commission
 - City Council
 - Redevelopment Agency
 - Environmental groups
 - Utilities agencies
 - Public Works & Environmental
 - Governmental agencies (permitting, finance)

- Use RSVP list to follow up on invitees, electronically maintained.
- Central weekly meeting with developers, lenders, Redevelopment Agency, Planning Department, Public Works & Environmental, citizen groups.

f. PARKING

Top recommendations:

- Bring parking expert in at beginning.
- Manage residential parking.
- Create a parking benefit district
- Provide some commuter permit parking.

g. OVERALL

Success is most likely if all three of the following groups are actively supporting the TOD:

- Elected officials
- Experienced developers
- Community activists

V. SURVEYS

Nine written surveys and six emailed surveys (or 27% of the total attendees) were returned, with the following results:

- What they learned – New parking strategies (4), “I learned something new from most of the speakers (1); importance of getting early approval of funding sources (1), good background info overall (1), helpful to compare notes with county projects (1), agency coordination (1), a number of new ideas on the process (1), could be doing more to educate locals about ideas and new tools that are available (1), “probably learned the most from the experiences Arabella Martinez shared, though the consultant from Nelson Nygaard was really great also – he had quite a few nice tools to try (1), Good facts and figures about urban infill from Signature Properties representative, learned about local players interest in TOD (via who attended), learned more about the real estate development process and about current status of various projects which was helpful (1).
- What they are committed to pursuing after the workshop – Parking (3), funding (2), rail coordination (1), “I need to stay in touch with the stakeholders planning projects” (1).
- New solutions uncovered during breakout session – “Rail! Yes” (1), agency coordination (1), Have a major issue with rail crossings – didn’t solve the issue but agreed to have follow-up conversation with Union Pacific (1).
- Favorite speaker topics – Parking (6), Developer process (4), Successful Hercules TOD Example (6), Hazardous Materials (2), Funding (1), Fruitvale’s TOD Success (1). “All the speakers were excellent” (1), “All were helpful” (1), “Not enough time” (1).
- Suggestions for making workshop more effective – Very effective (1), a few more developers (1) 1-2 fewer speakers (1), more interactive troubleshooting/problem solving (1), shorter (1), focus on impacts on potential neighbors (1), focus more intensively on fewer obstacles to TOD (1), more time for questions (1), handout to

show the process of how development proposals are considered through BART staff (1).

- Suggestions for future workshops or meetings – Discussion of bus-oriented TOD (1), funding (1), parking (1), green building and solar applications (1), addressing community opposition (1), some strategies on working with community residents, incorporating community benefits in the project, finding the right private developer partners (1), trip generate rates/parking rates for infill projects and their impact on TODs (1), regional land use and transportation coordination in planning (1), have BART talk about their parking replacement policies (1), a good design class on how and why non-motorized transportation (bicycle/pedestrian) needs to be given high priority would have been beneficial for many of the attendees (1), Verbal comment – add more elected officials.
- Speakers rated an average of 8.8/10.
- Breakout sessions rated an average of 6.4/10
- Facilitators rated an average of 7.5/10
- Handouts rated an average of 6.9/10

VI. SELF-EVALUATION

- a. **ATTENDANCE** – Higher than expected in the morning; additional tables and chairs were needed. Half of attendees left after lunch and before the breakout sessions. Those who did not attend the breakout sessions and responded to surveys had comments such as, “Had to leave,” “Other things demanded my attention,” “I was not able to attend,” “Did not attend [because] it seemed geared towards locals wanting to move their TOD projects forward,” and “I thought they might be geared more to developers and I represent just one component of development.”
- b. **AV EQUIPMENT** – Went relatively smoothly with the exception of Tom Weigel’s movie about Hercules not being played because of lack of speakers.
- c. **SPEAKERS** – Speakers were rated highly but many attendees noted that there wasn’t enough time for questions and answers.
- d. **BREAKOUT SESSIONS** – Half of the attendees attended; however, those who stayed for this session remained engaged at their tables for 1 hour, indicating an interest in that particular topic. Expectations were that attendees would move from table to table, but attendees appeared focused on a particular issue and didn’t leave that discussion.
- e. **RECEPTIONIST** – Front table was only staffed consistently the first hour of the workshop, not accounting for those who dropped by throughout the morning.
- f. **ROOM SETUP** – Underestimated number of attendees due to a high number of last minute walk ins, and had to quickly increase the number of tables and chairs in the room prior to starting the agenda.
- g. **HANDOUTS** – Surveys indicated a relatively low interest in the handouts. One suggestion was to have a handout that shows the process of how development proposals are considered through BART staff.

VII. WAS THE WORKSHOP A SUCCESS?

Eight objectives were identified prior to the workshop. They are listed below along with a post-workshop comment:

- a. *Clear, doable, new ideas for resolving problems.* The comment about new ideas most heard from attendees was parking replacement options.
- b. *Attendees define new tools to achieve implementation.* Some attendees mentioned new ideas about the process as well as the value of being connected face-to-face with agencies such as Union Pacific (UP) and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).
- c. *Attendees determine new policy to resolve obstacles.* No new policies were determined.
- d. *Sustainable way to continue problem solving.* No overall solution was identified but there were individual comments about making plans to follow-up with UP, for example.
- e. *Participation of elected officials.* Two elected officials and staff from a third elected official attended in addition to the two introductory speakers.
- f. *A TOD gets built soon.* (Too soon to know)
- g. *Attendees are energized and inspired.* More people attended than were anticipated and most if not all of them stayed to hear all the speakers. Those who were inspired to find solutions to their particular obstacles and did not have other commitments stayed for the breakout session. Once in the breakout sessions, very few, if any, left the breakout session early. All of this indicates a relatively high level of energy during the workshop.
- h. *Agencies shepherd new coalition with action items.* Although no new coalition was suggested at the workshop, a follow-up step could be CMA forming a coalition of agencies such as UP and DTSC. Many attendees noted the high value of being in the same room as these agencies.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. **ATTENDANCE** – Before the workshop and prior to final decision about topic and format of workshop, conduct verbal pre-surveys of invitees to gauge specific interest in attending any breakout sessions.
- b. **AV EQUIPMENT** – Make sure that all AV equipment, including speakers for movie presentations are set up ahead of time.
- c. **SPEAKERS** – Allow 30-minute intervals for speakers and Q&A.
- d. **BREAKOUT SESSIONS** – Combining the comment from Joan Malloy about the reason people attend meetings – because the projects are deemed “real” – a suggestion would be that CMA actively engages cities (staff and elected officials) to staff the breakout tables to encourage other participants to stay for session.
- e. **RECEPTIONIST** – Assign someone to the front table for the entire workshop.
- f. **ROOM SETUP** – Assume 10-15% more attendees than RSVPs.
- g. **HANDOUTS** – Include copies of PowerPoint presentations or summary outlines from each speaker. If doing a pre-workshop phone survey, ask people what kind of handouts they would like.

IX. NEXT STEPS SUGGESTIONS

This workshop could be viewed as the kickoff to an ongoing process by CMA to support TOD efforts in Alameda County. The following next steps are recommended in order to take advantage of the momentum begun with this workshop:

- a. **PHONE OR E-MAIL SURVEY:** CMA could conduct a phone survey of everyone who attended the workshop to find out the topic of the future discussions or workshops or meetings to ensure a high level of participation.
- b. **“TOD SQUAD:”** Building on the success of the central organizing committee of the Union City TOD, and on the fact that so many people attended on a regular basis because they considered it a “real” project, the CMA could convene a “TOD Squad” that meets on a regular basis. Each time the focus would be on one particular TOD project. Agencies and/or consultants/experts would be invited that could address the obstacles this TOD currently faces. Stakeholders from all 8 cities/TODs would be invited to be part of the conversation, even though the focus would be on solving the problems of an individual TOD. This would give the attendees something tangible to focus on for their project and keep the dialogue open between the involved parties. Also, hearing how others working on TODs are addressing their issues might also stimulate some creative solutions for the other TOD attendees.
- c. **FOCUSED WORKSHOPS/MEETINGS:** On one survey, an attendee said, “Great talk on the parking issue. I would love to have those comments and facts at my fingertips.” In fact, almost everyone who filled out a survey mentioned his or her interest in this particular topic. In addition to posting the presentation on the CMA website and holding regular “TOD Squad” meetings, a future workshop or focused meeting could address a particular topic. An example might be parking specialist Patrick Siegman and his colleagues at Nelson\Nygaard engaged to work out specific issues of one or more individual TOD projects. Another survey comment stated, “It would be great to have additional workshops to discuss BART-related issues,” which suggests that a focused workshop or meeting with BART, such as encouraging them to adopt new replacement standards for parking at BART TOD sites may also be very helpful. Other topics might be upcoming funding opportunities, or brainstorming more funding ideas, or following up with hazardous materials liability options.
- d. **FUNDING:** In addition to posting the funding presentation and workshop notes on CMA’s website, post funding sources and schedules that were discussed at the workshop.
- e. **TOD RESOURCE LIST:** Post a resource list of those with success in funding and building TODs in Alameda County, as well as contacts from agencies involved in the TOD process on CMA’s website. This could build off the TOD workshop speaker contact list.

X. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

One of the main purposes of a workshop is to connect people face-to-face with others who are seen as obstacles to their interests or that can educate them about successful efforts on similar project. For such huge projects and seemingly insurmountable obstacles as are seen with TOD projects, the results of these interactions may be seen months or even years later.

The following written comment from Matt Tomas of the City of San Leandro to Diane Stark sums up the workshop experience very well.

“Thanks for your efforts in organizing and good job on getting representation from Union Pacific and the private sector developers. There were lots of good stories shared that day, which gives us inspiration for putting together something more tangible that the development community can respond to in relation to the Central San Leandro BART station.”